

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 IN RE META PIXEL TAX FILING CASESUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 22-cv-07557-PCP

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
INTERVENE**

Re: Dkt. No. 245

12  
13 In this consolidated putative class action against Meta Platforms, Inc., plaintiffs assert  
14 several claims arising from Meta's alleged collection of their personal financial data through  
15 tracking tools installed on tax preparation websites including H&R Block, TaxAct, and TaxSlayer.  
16 Movants Julio Armstrong, Chesley Bonnes, Samantha Brewster, Patricia Carlson, Cessley Cole,  
17 Leslie Dent, Lonnie Dunaway, Joanna Gasperson, Flor Gomez, Beth Howard, Jason Karras, Justin  
18 Leo, Joseph Lipuma, Alysha Ottrix, Krystal Smith, Denise Sturgeon, Angela Wardell, Rosa  
19 Wardlow, Rachel Wegleitner and Kristen Wilder assert that they are members of the putative class  
20 who are currently arbitrating related claims against H&R Block. Movants seek to intervene in this  
21 action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) for the purpose of accessing certain  
22 protected discovery materials and expert witness reports, which movants state are necessary "to  
23 adequately prosecute their individual claims ... against H&R Block."<sup>1</sup> For the reasons that follow,  
24 the Court denies the motion to intervene.25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs also argue in a footnote that, "[i]n the alternative, intervention under [Federal Rule of  
28 Civil Procedure] 24(a) may also be appropriate." The Court need not address this argument. See  
*Est. of Saunders v. Comm'r*, 745 F.3d 953, 962 n.8 (9th Cir. 2014) ("Arguments raised only in  
footnotes ... are generally deemed waived.").

1       Third parties may sometimes use permissive intervention under Rule 24(b) to seek access  
2 to protected case materials for use in collateral litigation. *See, e.g., Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto.*  
3 *Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1131–32 (9th Cir. 2003); *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d  
4 470, 473–74 (9th Cir. 1992). But the Ninth Circuit has explained that doing so is appropriate only  
5 where it “advances the interests of judicial economy by avoiding the wasteful duplication of  
6 discovery.” *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1131 (citations omitted). Accordingly, “the collateral litigant”  
7 seeking to intervene for this purpose “must demonstrate the relevance of the protected discovery to  
8 the collateral proceedings *and its general discoverability therein.*” *Id.* at 1132 (emphasis added).  
9 Before granting a collateral litigant’s motion to intervene, a district court must “satisfy itself ...  
10 that a substantial amount of duplicative discovery will be avoided by modifying the protective  
11 order.” *Id.* In other words, if intervention and subsequent modification of the protective order  
12 would not “place [the collateral] litigants in a position they would otherwise reach ... after  
13 repetition of [a party’s] discovery,” intervention is not proper. *Id.* (quoting *United Nuclear Corp.*  
14 *v. Cranford Ins. Co.*, 905 F.2d 1424, 1428 (10th Cir. 1990)). Denying intervention in such  
15 circumstances “prevents collateral litigants from gaining access to discovery materials merely to  
16 subvert limitations on discovery in another proceeding.” *Id.* at 1132 (citing *Wilk v. Am. Med.*  
17 *Ass’n*, 635 F.2d 1295, 1300 (7th Cir. 1980)).

18       Here, movants have not established that the protected discovery materials they seek would  
19 be discoverable in their collateral arbitration proceedings. Indeed, their motion expressly concedes  
20 that “the materials are otherwise unavailable due to [the] potentially more restrictive discovery and  
21 third-party subpoena rules” that apply in their private arbitrations before the American Arbitration  
22 Association.<sup>2</sup> There is thus no risk that the discovery in movants’ arbitration proceedings will be  
23 entirely duplicative of the discovery conducted in this matter. And denying movants’ request to  
24 intervene is proper to “prevent the subversion of any limitations on discovery” in the arbitration.”  
25 *HDT Bio Corp. v. Emcure Pharms., Ltd.*, No. C22-0334JLR, 2022 WL 4131589, at \*2 (W.D.  
26

---

27       <sup>2</sup> Movants attempt to walk back this statement in their reply, arguing that they will “have certain  
28 discovery rights in” their arbitration proceedings. That general assertion does not rebut their earlier  
concession that the specific materials they seek in this litigation may not be discoverable in their  
arbitrations.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 Wash. Sept. 9, 2022) (quoting *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at 1133).

2 Movants' arguments to the contrary are unavailing. First, they argue that they are entitled  
3 to access the protected discovery materials because they are members of the putative class. But  
4 putative class members are not parties to the litigation, *Miller v. Nature's Path Foods, Inc.*, No.  
5 23-CV-05711-JST, 2024 WL 4177940, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2024), and the Supreme Court  
6 has affirmed that a putative class members' motion for "intervention under [Rule] 24(b) may be  
7 denied in the discretion of the District Court," *Crown, Cork & Seal Co. v. Parker*, 462 U.S. 345,  
8 351 n.4 (1983). Next, movants argue that the nature of the forum in which collateral litigation  
9 proceeds does not bear on whether collateral litigants may intervene. But the issue here is not the  
10 nature of the forum; it is the sought-after material's "discoverability therein." *Foltz*, 331 F.3d at  
11 1132. Had movants established that the protected documents to which they seek access would be  
12 discoverable in their arbitration proceedings, the Court's conclusion might differ. But they are not  
13 entitled to use intervention in this action to make an end-run around the conceded limits on  
14 discovery in their arbitration proceedings.

15 For the foregoing reasons, movant's motion to intervene is DENIED.

16  
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: December 15, 2025

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
P. Casey Pitts  
United States District Judge